

Miller & Rhoads

Read This List for Bargains In Odds and Ends

White Goods Remnants

10c and 12 1/2c grades, 5c yard.
15c and 25c grades, 10c yard.

Wash Goods Remnants

10c and 12 1/2c grades, 5c yard.
15c and 25c grades, 8 1/2c yard.

Outing Flannel and Flannelette Remnants

10c, 12 1/2c and 15c grades, now 5c yard.
At about half the full piece prices.

Short Pieces and Remnants of Dress Goods and Silks

50c Silks, now 25c yard.
50c Silks, now 35c yard.
50c Silks, now 50c yard.
25c to 50c Dress Goods, 15c yard.
25c to 75c Dress Goods, 25c yard.
75c to \$1.00 Dress Goods, 50c yard.
\$1 to \$1.50 Dress Goods, 75c yard.

Cotton and Sheeting Remnants

Bleached and Unbleached.
Grades up to 10c for 5c yard.
15c to 25c grades, 12 1/2c yard.
25c to 35c grades, 17c yard.

Wool, Flannels and Eiderdown Remnants

At about half the full piece prices.

Our Embroidery Department

has moved to the second floor, Sixth Street side, opposite the elevator and adjacent to the Mulin Underwear Department.

The business has grown to such proportions that more room was required in which to handle it, and the new location enables us to give double the space to Embroideries that they formerly had.

Buster Brown and Mary Jane.

The Times-Dispatch has arranged to continue the publication of the genuine Buster Brown feature by Richard F. Outcault. This page for next Sunday will be found especially entertaining. Mary Jane is on a visit to Buster, and her introduction to the family is attended with some rather trying experiences. Everybody, old and young, will be interested in the experiences of these two young characters.

NEWS GATHERED FROM SOUTHSIDE

Swansboro May Become An Incorporated Town.

The bill is demurred to that the suit was instituted within the period fixed by the statute, there is no good reason for requiring the bill to allege that fact, since the court will take judicial notice of the fact that the suit was instituted within the period fixed by the statute.

The other ground of demurrer is that the bill failed to allege that the complainants gave notice of the amount and character of their claims to Mahony, the owner of the land, as required by section 2477 of the Code.

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

"The decision of this question depends upon the construction of the contract between Mahony and Ryan, under which the buildings on the lot were erected."

The court says: "The bills do not allege such notice, but the contention of the complainants, appellees here, is that they were not sub-contractors, and therefore no such notice was necessary."

WRESTLING WITH CITY'S BUDGET

Finance Committee Hears From Representatives of Charitable Institutions.

The Committee on Finance held a special meeting last night to hear from the representatives of the hospitals and other institutions to which the city makes annual appropriations. This was in order to learn their wants, so as to determine what shall be their positions on the budget when the same shall be made up.

Eight or ten good women who are connected with the various charitable institutions were present to answer questions and give information concerning their institutions, and some of them addressed the committee.

The Rossmore Library was represented by Mr. Wyldham R. Meredith, who said he spoke for Mrs. Bagby, whose indolence prevented her attendance upon the committee's meeting. Mr. Meredith asked that the appropriation for the library be increased from \$1,000 to \$1,500.

Colonel Peyton R. Carrington, who was accompanied to the meeting by several ladies, spoke for them in the interest of the Home for Incurables. The present appropriation is \$400. Colonel Carrington showed the needs of the institution and expressed the hope that the appropriation may be increased, but he named no amount.

The Sheltering Arms Hospital was represented by Mrs. George T. King, who told of the good work that has been done in this strictly charitable institution, and asked that the appropriation be increased from \$400 to \$500. Mr. A. C. Guiguen also spoke for the Sheltering Arms.

The Retreat for the Sick was represented by Mrs. A. E. Warren, who simply asked that the last appropriation of \$500 be continued.

Mr. John B. Minor spoke for the visiting Nurses Association and the Nurses Settlement and asked that they be given \$200 each.

Mr. L. O. Wendenburg addressed the committee in behalf of the Foundling Hospital, Thirtieth and Clay Street, and asked that \$1,000 be allowed the institution.

This hospital has not heretofore been in the budget.

Relief for Hospitals.

Dr. Charles R. Robbins on behalf of the Memorial Hospital asked that the appropriation be made large enough to cover the hospital's gas and water bills, and to produce the figures to show that it will require about \$1,500. The last appropriation was \$200.

The Virginia Hospital, represented by Dr. Hugh M. Taylor, also asked that the new appropriation be increased sufficient to cover gas and water bills.

"Continued," he said, "the hospital for the Home for Needy Confederate Women, and also for the Spring Street Home and asked \$200 for the former and \$300 for the latter."

The Ear and Eye Infirmary sent a letter to say it would be satisfied with and grateful for the same amount as before, \$400.

Chairman Wood called attention to the Belle Bryan Day Nursery and Kindergarten, explained its work in taking care of the children of working women in the daytime so that worthy mothers could go to work, and asked that the appropriation be increased to \$1,000.

Dr. Jones, colored, asked for a small appropriation for the Woman's Central League Training School and Hospital, located on North Third Street. Mr. Spence asked that the appropriation be increased to \$1,000.

The committee took no action on the appropriations asked. Monday night was set for the next meeting at which time the committee will take up the "wants" of streets, grounds and buildings, James River improvement and the fire department.

Superintendent Bolling, of the Water Department, and Chairman Grimes of the Water Committee, presented the "wants" of the water department, the superintendent submitting a complete inventory of all the material on hand and other property of the department.

The committee then adjourned to meet Monday night at 8 o'clock.

MRS. BURTON GETS AN INJUNCTION

(Continued from First Page.)

vision for her maintenance and support, and since that time has declined to make any provision for her support, except several payments of \$20 each, made under an order for alimony entered by a Philadelphia court in a suit brought by her for divorce; that the said suit for divorce was begun in 1901, but the decree for alimony was not available because Burton could not be found, and the papers could not be served on him; that she is without means of support, except what little she can earn by her own work; that while she had some money and property of her own when she married Burton, at his solicitation the property was disposed of and the proceeds spent by him before she deserted her.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 1906, which amounts to \$1,500, now justly due for past support.

The petitioner is advised, says the paper, that under the law Burton should provide support for her pending the divorce suit in Philadelphia and that under the order of that court, he is now due her at least \$30 per month for each and every month from November 1, 1901, to January 1, 19